REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 14 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by St. Clair. Claims 27 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Hokaku in view of Casady '746.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection

Claims 14 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by St. Clair.

St. Clair shows a golf bag and golf cart carrier attached to the rear of an automobile10 having a rear deck or trunk lid 12. (See col. 3, lines 40 to 43).

Claim 14 recites "a mountable device for *a golf car* comprising:

a frame for placement in a bag bay of the golf car, *the frame having a frame section contacting a bottom of the bag bay.*"

The use of the word for in the preamble defines the scope of the art, and as such carriers not for use with golf cars (as St. Clair clearly is not) are not analagous art. The entire contxt of the present invention is related to golf cars, and it is respectfully submitted that St. Clair automobile carrier is not a mountable device for a golf car as claimed. Fig. 1 shows St. Clair with an automobile. The golf carts referred to by St. Clair are the pull carts shown in Fig. 2.

St. Clair also does not disclose a mountable device for a golf car, but rather for an automobile.

Moreover, no part of any frame in St. Clair contacts a bottom of a bag bay of a golf car as claimed in claim 14. There is no "for" in the contacting language of claim 14.

With respect the office action arguments, bumper 11 is not a bag holder frame.

In addition, there is no hitch section which extends downwardly from the frame section which contacts the bottom of a bag bay.

Furthermore, elements 41, 42 are not "hitches", as now claimed. There is at most one "hitch" in St. Clair.

With further respect to claim 16, no driven actuators are shown. The brackets are not actuators.

With further respect to claim 18, an L shape of one tube clearly is not a claw.

With further respect to claim 23, there is no teaching that the asserted hitching elements extend over the bumper, and certainly not over a bumper of a golf car.

With further respect to claim 25, St. Clair does not teach this limitation.

With respect to independent claim 26, claim 26 recites a "mountable device for a golf car comprising:

a frame for placement in a bag bay of the golf car, a frame section contacting a bottom of the bag bay."

St. Clair device is not for a golf car and does not have a frame section contacting a bottom of a bag bay. St. Clair also does not show two hitches.

With respect to independent claim 27, claim 27 recites a "mountable device for a golf car comprising: a frame for placement in the bag bay of the golf car." The St. Clair device is not for a golf car and does not have a frame for placement in a bag bay. St. Clair also does not have two hitches.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection is thus respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 14 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Hokaku in view of Casady '746.

A full translation of Hokaku is provided herewith.

Cassidy shows arms 29, 30 which support a golf bag which rests in the bag bay.

As admitted, Hokaku does not show two hitches as claimed in claim 14 and 27. In fact Hokaku teaches away from two hitches, as the carrier 2 carries a plurality of bags. See [0011].

As such, there is not reason or motivation to use the Casady teachings, as Hokaku already provides for a multiple golf bags in a single carrier 2. A fair viewing also shows the devices are rather different structurally.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 to claims 14 and 27 and their dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 27 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Casady '746 in view of Tang '031.

Cassidy shows arms 29, 30 which support a golf bag which rests in the bag bay. Tang shows golf bag carriers with wheels.

Claim 27 recites "a first detachable device connected to the first hitching device, the first detachable device having at least one first wheel for contacting ground and the first hitching device ***supporting an entire weight of the first detachable device when the first wheel is off the ground***."

The golf bag of Cassidy by necessity rests in the golf bag bay and even if combinable with Tang (which is seems it would not be), the bottom of the Tang device clearly would rest partially on the golf bag bay bottom. Neither Cassidy not Tang show any "hitching device supporting an entire weight" of the asserted detachable device, since the weight bearing in Cassidy is split between the golf bag bay and the arms, (and it appears most of the weight rests on the golf bag bay and is not carried by the arms).

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 to claim 27 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____
Morey B. Wildes, Reg. No. 36,968

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940